

1 QUINN EMANUEL URQUHART & SULLIVAN, LLP

Charles K. Verhoeven (Bar No. 170151)

2 charlesverhoeven@quinnemanuel.com

David A. Perlson (Bar No. 209502)

3 davidperlson@quinnemanuel.com

Melissa Baily (Bar No. 237649)

4 melissabaily@quinnemanuel.com

John Neukom (Bar No. 275887)

5 johnneukom@quinnemanuel.com

Jordan Jaffe (Bar No. 254886)

6 jordanjaffe@quinnemanuel.com

50 California Street, 22nd Floor

7 San Francisco, California 94111-4788

Telephone: (415) 875-6600

8 Facsimile: (415) 875-6700

9 Attorneys for WAYMO LLC

10 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

11 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA, SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION

12 WAYMO LLC,

13 Plaintiff,

14 vs.

15 UBER TECHNOLOGIES, INC.;
16 OTTOMOTTO LLC; OTTO TRUCKING
LLC,

17 Defendants.

CASE NO. 3:17-cv-00939-WHA

**PLAINTIFF WAYMO LLC'S
ADMINISTRATIVE MOTION TO FILE
UNDER SEAL WAYMO'S MOTION IN
LIMINE NO. 16**

Pursuant to Civil L.R. 7-11 and 79-5, Plaintiff Waymo LLC (“Waymo”) respectfully requests to file under seal information in its September 16, 2017 Motion *in Limine* No. 16 and exhibits thereto, as well as Defendants’ response and exhibits thereto. Specifically, Waymo requests an order granting leave to file under seal the portions of the documents as listed below:

Document	Portions to Be Filed Under Seal	Designating Party
Exhibit A to Waymo’s Motion	Portions highlighted in red	Waymo
Exhibit F to Waymo’s Motion	Portions highlighted in red	Waymo
Portions of Otto Trucking’s Opposition to Waymo’s Motion in Limine No. 16 (“Otto Trucking’s Opposition”)	Portions highlighted in green	Waymo
Exhibit 5 to Otto Trucking’s Opposition	Portions in green	Waymo
Exhibit 6 to Otto Trucking’s Opposition	Portions in green	Waymo
Exhibit 7 to Otto Trucking’s Opposition	Portion in green	Waymo

I. LEGAL STANDARD

Civil Local Rule 79-5 requires that a party seeking sealing “establish[] that the document, or portions thereof, are privileged, protectable as a trade secret or otherwise entitled to protection under the law” (*i.e.*, is “sealable”). Civil L.R. 79-5(b). The sealing request must also “be narrowly tailored to seek sealing only of sealable material.” *Id.*

II. THE COURT SHOULD SEAL WAYMO’S CONFIDENTIAL INFORMATION

The Court should seal the portions of Waymo’s Exhibits A, F, portions of Otto Trucking’s Opposition, and Otto Trucking Exhibits 5-7 because they disclose Waymo’s trade secrets and confidential business information. *See* Cooper Dec., ¶ 4. Courts have determined that trade secret information merits sealing. *Music Grp. Macao Commercial Offshore Ltd. v. Foote*, No. 14–cv–03078–JSC, 2015 WL 3993147, at *1 (N.D. Cal. June 30, 2015) (quoting *Kamakana*, 447 F.3d at 1179); *see also Brocade Commc’ns Sys., Inc. v. A10 Networks, Inc.*, No. C 10-3428 PSG, 2013 WL

211115, at *1, *3 (N.D. Cal. Jan. 17, 2013) (granting request to seal document that “consists entirely of descriptions of Brocade’s trade secrets.”). Confidential business information that, if released, may “harm a litigant’s competitive standing” also merits sealing. *See Nixon v. Warner Commc’ns, Inc.*, 435 U.S. 589, 598-99 (1978). Waymo seeks to seal confidential business information and trade secret information that fit squarely within these categories. Cooper Dec. ¶ 4. Waymo maintains this information as a trade secret (*see* Dkt. 25-31) and ensures the information remains secret with strict secrecy and security protocols (*see* Dkt. 25-47; Dkt. 25-49.). *Id.* Waymo has narrowly tailored its requests to only information meriting sealing. *Id.* In fact, both *Music Grp.* and *Brocade* found the confidential information at issue in those cases met the heightened “compelling reasons” standard for sealing. *Music Grp.*, 2015 WL 3993147, at *1; *Brocade*, 2013 WL 211115, at *1, *3. The information that Waymo seeks to seal, therefore, also meets this heightened standard. The disclosure of Waymo’s trade secret and confidential business information would harm Waymo. Cooper Dec. ¶ 4. Moreover, the scope of information that Waymo is seeking to seal is consistent with other administrative motions to seal that have already been granted by the Court in this case. (*See* Dkt. 681.) Thus, the Court should grant Waymo’s administrative motion to seal.

16 **III. CONCLUSION**

17 In compliance with Civil Local Rule 79-5(d), redacted and unredacted versions of the
18 above listed documents accompany this Administrative Motion. For the foregoing reasons,
19 Waymo respectfully requests that the Court grant Waymo’s Administrative Motion.

21 DATED: September 13, 2017

QUINN EMANUEL URQUHART & SULLIVAN,
LLP

23 By /s/ Charles Verhoeven

Charles Verhoeven
Attorneys for WAYMO LLC